DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 851 CG 013 972

AUTHOR Wiebe, Ken F.; Fleck, J. Roland
TITLE Personality Correlates of Intrinsic, Extrinsic and Non-Religious Orientations.
PUB DATE [76]
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Psychological Association (59th, San Diego, California, April 5-8, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; College Freshmen; Comparative Analysis; *Emotional Response; *Ethics; Foreign Countries; *Individual Characteristics; *Moral Values; *Personality Studies; Profile Evaluation; *Religious Factors; Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Canada

ABSTRACT

Personality profiles of university freshmen (N=158) were compared across religious orientation and religious affiliation. The hypotheses that profiles of extrinsically religious and non-religious subjects would correlate significantly with each other, and that both would differ significantly from intrinsically religious subjects were supported by the data. The personality profiles included superego strength, emotional sensitivity, and liberalism. Differences were also found across religious affiliation for certain personality variables. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED178851

PERSONALITY CORRELATES OF INTRINSIC, EXTRINSIC AND NON-RELIGIOUS ORIENTATIONS

Ken F. Wiebe

and

J. Roland Fleck

ROSEMEAD GRADUATE SCHOOL

OF PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

Running head: Personality and Religious Orientation

CG 013972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ken F. Wiebe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PERSONALITY CORRELATES OF INTRINSIC, EXTRINSIC AND NON-RELIGIOUS ORIENTATIONS

Various theoretical positions have been presented by psychologists with regard to religious behavior. Such diverse theorists as Allport (1956), Frankl (1967), and Jung (1938) suggest religion may have a positive effect on the psychological well-being of an individual by forming a basis of integration for the different facets of life, thereby providing meaning, and initiating greater emotional stability and cohesion. An alternate position has been suggested by Freud (1953), Jones (1923), Reik (1951), and Oates (1959). They see a relationship between religious behavior and psycho-neurosis. Religious behavior is interpreted within an obsessive-compulsive paradigm, and can be related to a delusional effort of wish fulfillment. In light of the contradictory theoretical systems it seems appropriate to examine the research investigating the personality correlates of religious behavior.

Research reveals a number of correlations between certain personality variables and religious orientation. According to Allport (1967) religious orientation can be defined within two basic categories. The extrinsic religious orientation describes the individual whose religious belief and concommitant behavior are primarily a function of utilitarian motivation. This individual interprets religion as being expedient.

The intrinsic religious orientation describes the individual whose religious belief forms the basis or central focus for life: it is very personal and tends to determine the consistent parameters of appropriate behaviors.

Religious subjects tend to be more conservative than non-religious subjects (Barton & Vaughan, 1976; Eysenck, 1970; Hamby, 1973); however, extrinsically religious tend to be less conservative than intrinsically religious subjects (Tate & Miller, 1971). Religious subjects also seem to be less dominant than non-religious subjects (Barton & Vaughan, 1976; Hamby, 1973). However, intrinsically religious subjects are more submissive and trusting, while extrinsically religious subjects tend to be more dominant, self-assertive, and suspicious (Hamby, 1973; Kahoe, 1974; Tate & Miller, 1971). Non-religious subjects (Brown & Warmer, 1951; Kahoe, 1974).

Differences between intrinsically and extrinsically oriented religious subjects appear in regard to dependence as well. Intrinsically religious subjects tend to be more dependent and sociable; extrinsically religious and non-religious subjects are more self-sufficient and aggressive (Barton & Vaughan, 1976; Hamby, 1973).

Research concerning emotional stability has yielded contradictory results. Religious subjects have in some studies been found to be more emotional, tense, and insecure than non-religious subjects (Barton & Vaughan, 1976; Slater, 1947);

however, Brown and Warmer (1951) report non-religious subjects as more insecure and tense. In addition extrinsically religious and non-religious subjects tend to be more emotional than those who are intrinsically religious (Hamby, 1973; Kahoe, 1974).

An examination of the research reveals an interesting trend in terms of personality and religious orientation. Extrinsically religious subjects tend to be similar to non-religious subjects, but different from intrinsically religious subjects. The present study is designed to investigate the hypotheses that personality profiles of extrinsically religious subjects will correlate significantly with those of non-religious subjects; and that the profiles of both of these groups will differ significantly from those of intrinsically religious subjects. A discriminant function analysis will be employed to extract those personality variables which are significant indices of variation between religious orientation types. The role of religious affiliation will also be considered.

METHODS

SUBJECTS

One hundred and fifty-eight university freshmen from central Canada participated in the research. All of the subjects were volunteers. They were all between seventeen and twenty-two years old and had lived in Canada for at least ten years. The subjects' religious affiliation had not changed in the last five years and they were presently Catholic, Protestant, or non-religious.

INSTRUMENTATION

Allport's "Religiosity Scale" and Cattell's "Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire" were administered to each subject. Prior to these scales subjects were given a questionnaire requesting information about their religious affiliation and the length of this affiliation, age and sex, the number of university courses completed, and the number of years they had lived in Canada.

PROCEDURE

Subjects were tested in groups and asked to complete the three part questionnaire. They were told the purpose of the experiment was to examine various religious ideas, social opinions, and personal attitudes. The "Religiosity Scale" was used to classify the Catholic and Protestant subjects as intrinsically or extrinsically oriented in

religious belief. The "Sixteen P-F" was used to construct standardized personality profiles for each subject.

RESULTS

A mixed analysis of variance indicate significant differences in personality profiles across religious orientation, F (15, 1740) = 2.51, $p < .01$. A Q-technique correlational analysis between personality profiles, with all sixteen personality variables included, yielded coefficients of r (14) = .475, $p > .05$ between intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientations; r (14) = .281, $p > .05$ between intrinsic and non-religious orientations; and r (14) = .653, $p < .01$ between extrinsic and non-religious orientations. Although the difference between the correlations for the intrinsic to non-religious comparison is non-significant, z = 1.25 $p > .05$, the hypothesis that extrinsic religious personality profiles will correlate significantly with non-religious personality profiles is supported. Furthermore, the analysis of variance indicates personality profiles do differ significantly across extrinsic and intrinsic religious orientations.

Although these results support the hypotheses stated in the introduction the evaluation of differences between personality profiles across religious affiliation F (15, 1740) = 2.35, $p < .01$ and across religious affiliation by religious orientation F (15, 1740) = 2.72, $p < .01$ is important. In both of these cases there are significant differences in

personality profiles when religious affiliation is taken into consideration.

A Q-technique factor analysis with orthogonal rotation yielded three factors (Table 1). The first factor reflects a Protestant intrinsic religious orientation; the second factor reflects an extrinsic and non-religious orientation; and the third factor reflects a Catholic intrinsic religious orientation. Intrinsic personality profiles tend to differ across religious affiliation; however, there appears to be less of a difference between extrinsic orientations which tend to be similar to non-religious personality profiles.

Insert Table 1

In order to determine specific differences in personality profiles across the five groups - instrinsic Protestant, instrinsic Catholic, extrinsic Protestant, extrinsic Catholic, and non-religious a discriminant function analysis extracted six of the original sixteen personality variables of the "Sixteen P-F" as significant indicators of variation between the personality profiles across the five religious categories. The six variables in order of significance are superego strength (G) F (4, 153) = 6.57, $p < .01$; general intellectual ability (B) F (4, 153) = 4.82, $p < .01$; emotional sensitivity (I) F (4, 153) = 4.21, $p < .01$; extraversion (F) F (4, 153) = 3.97, $p < .01$; dominance (E) F (4, 153) = 3.78, $p < .01$;

and liberalism (Q_1) F (4, 153) = 3.57, $p < .01$.

Insert Table 2

The multivariage F-ratios tend to be significant across religious orientation but not religious affiliation (Table 3). This trend suggests religious orientation has a greater reliability in predicting personality differences than religious affiliation. Univariate F-ratios for planned comparisons of the six personality variables across intrinsic by a combined extrinsic/non-religious orientation were significant for superego strength (G), emotional sensitivity (I), and liberalism (Q_1) (Table 4). Instrinsically religious individuals tend to be higher in superego strength and emotional sensitivity, and lower in liberalism than extrinsically and non-religious individuals.

Insert Table 3

Insert Table 4

In addition to the above personality correlates of the various religious orientations a discriminant analysis yielded four discriminant functions, of which the first and third were significant (Table 5). The first function (plotted along the abscissa) presents a bipolar continuum with intelligence on one end and neurosis on the other. (See Figure 1). The intelligence dimension was comprised of the intelligence subscale (B) of the "Sixteen P-F" and the neurosis dimension was

comprised of the subscales emotional sensitivity (I) and superego strength (G). According to Cattell, Eber and Tatsuoka (1970) the simultaneous occurrence of these latter two subscales suggests the presence of neurotic tendencies. The standardized discriminant function coefficients for the above variables are as follows-intelligence (B) -.24, emotional sensitivity (I) .32, superego strength (G) .32. The second significant function (plotted along the ordinate) presents a bipolar continuum moving from achievement to aggression (See Figure 1). The achievement dimension consisted of the joint positive loadings of intelligence (B) (.23) and superego strength (G) (.28). Cattell et al. (1970) suggest the presence of these two variables occur when there is a relatively high need for achievement. The aggression dimension reflected the negative loading (-.37) of the dominance subscale (E) which reflects aggressive tendencies (Cattell, et. al., 1970).

Insert Table 5

Insert Figure 1

When the five religious groups are plotted along both continuums simultaneously certain distinctions appear which elucidate the significant interactions between religious affiliation and religious orientation (Figure 1). Intrinsically religious Protestants tend to be moderately neurotic

and slightly achieving, but lower in aggression. Intrinsically religious Catholics tend to be strongly neurotic and aggressive, but lower in both the intelligence and achievement dimensions. Extrinsically religious Protestants tend to be moderately achieving and intelligent, but low in aggression and neurosis. Extrinsically religious Catholics are more difficult to describe since they are located near the intersection of the two axes. They tend to be slightly neurotic and achieving but to a lesser degree than the intrinsically religious Protestants. Non-religious subjects tend to be strongly intelligent and moderately aggressive. Of the five religious groups they indicate the least trend towards neurosis. In light of this information it would seem appropriate to consider both religious orientation and religious affiliation when making predictions about the personalities of religious individuals. Whereas some personality variables seem to be predominantely correlated with religious orientation others are correlated with religious affiliation.

DISCUSSION

The hypothesis that intrinsically religious individuals would differ significantly from both extrinsically and non-religious individuals was supported by this study. In addition the profiles of extrinsically and non-religious individuals are correlated.

Intrinsically religious subjects tend to have a greater concern for moral standards, conscientiousness, discipline, responsibility and consistency than those subjects who are extrinsically or non-religious. Intrinsically religious subjects also appear to be more sensitive, dependent, empathic, and open to their emotions. In addition, they tend to reflect more conservative and traditional attitudes. Although these characteristics have positive features they can degenerate into pathological rigidity which may lead to a neurotic style of living. From the preceding description an obvious pathological response could be obsessive compulsivity.

Extrinsically religious and non-religious subjects tend to reflect greater self-indulgence, indolence, and undependability. They tend to be more flexible, self-reliant, skeptical, pragmatic, and less sentimental. They also seem to be more innovative, analytical and free thinking.

In taking these differences into consideration an interaction between personality and level of religious commitment becomes apparent. Since an intrinsic orientation tends to reflect a more committed religious stance, it appears individuals interact differently with religious doctrine, in this case, a Christian belief system. Under these conditions certain personality traits seem to become dominant. Difficulties regarding interpretation become apparent when attempting to analyze a correlational study. In terms of direction of effect several hypotheses are possible. It is possible

certain personality variables create an affinity for particular degrees of religiosity. On the other hand, it is possible religious experiences have an effect on an individual's personality. A third alternative would be that there are other extraneous factors which affect both personality and religiosity. To resolve this dilemma will require more thorough research.

A difficulty with the interpretation of the personality descriptions of religious orientation is the confounding effect of religious affiliation. The personality variables which discriminate personality profiles across religious orientation are superego strength, emotional sensitivity, and liberalism. However, aggression, achievement, intelligence, and neurosis are the variables which tend to discriminate the groups when both religious orientation and affiliation are taken into consideration. A surprising finding are the similarities between Protestant intrinsic and Catholic extrinsic profiles. A possible explanation might be that the Catholic extrinsic individuals in moving away from a traditional authoritarian framework become less aggressive and less subject to neurotic tendencies and at the same time become more motivated to achieve and in the latter sense become similar to Protestant intrinsic individuals.

This paper has demonstrated the variability of certain personality variables when factors such as religious orienta-

tion and religious affiliation are taken into consideration and controlled. Other psychometric tools might yield further differences between the religious categories examined in this research. It would also be of interest to repeat this study with individuals of other religious persuasions to see whether the trends found here can be replicated.

References:

Allport, G.W. The Individual and His Religion. New York: MacMillan, 1956.

Allport, G.W. Personal religious orientation and prejudice. J.of Personal. & Soc. Psychol., 1967, 5, 432-443.

Barton, K. & Vaughan, G. Church membership and personality. Soc. Behav. & Person., 1976, 4 (1), 11-16.

Brown, D. & Warmer, L. Religious beliefs and personality characteristics of college students. J. of Soc. Psychol., 1951, 33, 103-129.

Cattell, R.B., Eber, H.W., & Tatsuoka, M.M. Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. Champaign, IL.: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1970.

Eysenck, H.J. The Structure of Human Personality. London: Metheun, 1970.

Frankl, V. Psychotherapy and Existentialism. New York: Washington Square Press, 1967.

Freud, S. Future of an Illusion. New York: Liveright, 1953.

Hamby, J. Some personality correlates of religious orientation. Dissertation Abst. Internat., 1973, 34 (3-A), 1127-1128.

Jones, E. Papers on Psycho-Analysis. London: Bailliere, Tindall, & Cox, 1923.

Jung, C. Psychology and Religion. London: Yale University Press, 1938.

Kahoe, R.D. Personality and achievement correlates of intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientations. J. of Personal. & Soc. Psychol., 1974, 29 (6), 812-818.

Oates, W.E. The role of religion in psychoses. In O. Strunk, Jr. (Ed.), Readings in the Psychology of Religion. New York: Abingdon, 1959. Pp. 235-244.

Reik, T. Dogma and Compulsion. Westport: Greenwood, 1951.

Slater, E. Neurosis and religious affiliation. J. of Ment. Sci., 1947, 93, 392-398.

Tate, E. & Miller, G. Differences in value systems of persons with varying religious orientations. J. for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1971, 10 (4), 357-365.

Table 1

Orthogonal factor loadings

for each religious category

	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III
Protestant Intrinsic---	.95	.05	.22
Catholic Intrinsic---	.30	.11	.92
Protestant Extrinsic---	.09	.93	-.07
Catholic Extrinsic---	.60	.61	.38
Non-Religious---	.07	.77	.40
Cumulative % variance accounted for	55.0	77.0	87.9

Table 2

Means and variances of six significant personality variables for each religious category

Religious Category:	n	"B" $\bar{X}$	"B" s^2	"E" $\bar{X}$	"E" s^2	"F" $\bar{X}$	"F" s^2	"G" $\bar{X}$	"G" s^2	"I" $\bar{X}$	"I" s^2	"Q_1" $\bar{X}$	"Q_1" s^2
Protestant Intrinsic	23	5.8	2.53	5.5	4.26	5.3	2.04	6.3	3.20	6.3	3.20	4.5	3.80
Catholic Intrinsic	18	4.2	5.11	6.3	5.41	6.7	3.96	5.3	4.71	6.6	4.73	4.6	7.32
Protestant Extrinsic	37	5.7	2.89	5.3	3.69	6.1	2.89	4.8	3.28	5.1	4.55	5.8	3.69
Catholic Extrinsic	46	5.0	3.35	5.1	5.66	6.2	4.45	5.1	2.66	5.6	2.46	4.9	3.31
Non-Religious	34	5.7	3.92	6.4	4.84	5.4	5.43	3.9	2.04	4.9	3.13	5.3	3.31
Total	158		3.46		4.82		3.89		2.98		3.45		3.92

Table 3

Multivariate F-matrix for group comparisons using six extracted personality variables

	Protestant Intrinsic	Protestant Extrinsic	Catholic Intrinsic	Catholic Extrinsic
Protestant Intrinsic--	0.00			
Protestant Extrinsic--	4.01*	0.00		
Catholic Intrinsic--	3.26	5.03*	0.00	
Catholic Extrinsic--	2.83	1.47	2.41	0.00
Non-Religious--	5.27*	2.74	5.99*	4.72*

*$\alpha < .01$ df=4, 153

Table 4

Univariate F-ratios for planned comparisons of personality variable means across intrinsic orientation by extrinsic/non-religious orientation

Variable	Difference between means	F
Intelligence "B"	-.50	2.16
Dominance "E"	.32	.66
Extraversion "F"	.13	.14
Superego Strength "G"	1.16	13.72*
Emotional Sensitivity "I"	1.20	12.67*
Liberalism "Q_1"	-.84	5.45*

df=1/ 153 *α<.05

Table 5

Discriminant Functions	λ	%	Canonical r	Λ	X^2	df	p
1	.3151	53.23	.490	.5859	80.99	24	<.01
2	.1370	23.14	.347	.8795	19.45	15	>.05
3	.1279	21.60	.337	.8866	18.23	8	<.05
4	.0120	2.03	.109	.9881	1.81	3	>.05

Figure 1

Plot of Significant Discriminant Functions